REMARKS

The Office action mailed October 20, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The pending claims, claims 1 and 6-9, were rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish over the applied art. The specification fully supports such amendments to claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration in view of the following is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Saito (US 6,480,884) in view of Birrell et al. (US 6,189,026). Specifically, the Examiner deemed that although Saito does not disclose retrieving address book data from a network device, it would have been obvious to employ server storing address book data as taught by Birrell et al. in order to allow the user mobility and dynamic address data across the network. The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Saito in view of Birrell et al. and further in view of Balogh et al. (US Pat. No. 5,893,101). The Examiner also rejected claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable by Saito in view of Birrell et al. and further in view of Donaldson (US Pat. No. 6,321,267).

Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Birrell et al. do not alleviate the deficiencies of Saito as to the address book data obtaining means now recited in claim 1.

Birrell et al. teach dynamically generating rather than storing address books. In particular, Birrell et al. disclose a technique for dynamically generating an address book as it is needed, through a network. See col. 10, lines 28-38. For example, as shown in Figure 8 of Birrell et al., address book mail message 810 is stored in file 400. The client computer 820 provides query 830, and then the content of the address book is transferred to the dynamic address book 840, and thereby transferred to a client computer 820.

Claim 1, as amended, first defines Applicants' scanner apparatus as one that transmits to any of multiple data processing apparatus that have address book data set therein. Applicants' scanner apparatus accesses such data processing apparatus over a network. Once a user enters

4

user data and a password, his address book is copied from his own remote computer. That is, in

the present invention, there is no need to generate address books dynamically. Rather there are

multiple address books respectively set in each of the multiple data processing apparatus, as

described in the preamble of claim 1. That is, as illustrated in Fig. 2 of Applicant's drawings,

Applicants' claimed scanner apparatus can access the address book of any of PC's PC1, PC2

through PCn in accordance with the user and password data entered to the control section 11.

Presumably, PC's, PC1 – PCn will be personal to different users and therefore each user will be

able to access and use addresses from his own address book, as stored in his personal PC.

Generally stated, each user can get his own address book from a remote computer (e.g., PC1,-

PCn). Applicants' contemplate that their scanner apparatus exists in a network structure where

several different address books are dispersed among a corresponding several data processing

apparatus. Specifically, it is stated at page 21, line 21 to page 22, line 2 that:

> when the "personal destination book" tub is operated, an address (IP address) of a
> personal computer corresponding to the user data entered at step S2 in Fig. 3 is read out
> of the user data memory 17. With respect to this address, the control section 11 transmits
> an address book data requesting signal through the network interface 19 to the network.

In contrast to the present invention, the address book of Birrell et al. is disposed on the

network. This address book is not possessed by a specific user. The address book is made on the

network by the request of each user. For example, at column 10, line 33, Birrell et al. states:

> For example, there can be "personal" and "public" related address books. In contrast,
> contrast, here, there is no separately stored address book. Instead, an "address book" is
> dynamically generated as it is needed.

Nowhere does Birrell et al. teach storing each address book in each computer in a dispersed

manner. Hence, in no way can Birrell et al. be said to teach or suggest Applicants' address book

data obtaining means defined as a device that obtains a (remote) address book from one of such

remotely dispersed data processing apparatus (computers), in accordance with proper user and

password data. To the contrary, because the object of Birrell et al. is to dynamically generate <u>one</u> address book, Birrell et al. does not even contemplate dispersed address books such as the present invention is structured to access.

The present invention is advantageous because "it is not necessary to store as a number of destination data in the address memory 16 of the digital copying machine 1, and therefore the capacity of the address memory 16 need not be so large", thereby resulting in a lower cost digital copying machine. See Applicants' page 23, lines 5-13. Nowhere do Birrell et al. teach or suggest obtaining and (temporarily) storing address books from a remote source in order to reduce required address memory. Consequently, Birrell et al. do not alleviate the deficiencies of Saito. The disclosures of Balogh et al. and Donaldson do not alleviate the deficiencies of Saito alone, or in combination with Birrell et al.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed invention is unobvious and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should properly be withdrawn.

Request for Interview

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300**, Attorney Docket No. **032739M058**.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: March 20, 2006

1850 M Street, NW, #800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

7